



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

delegates at Paris has openly declared that he does not regard the Monroe Doctrine as compatible with the right of national independence or with a League of Free Nations. This aspect of the subject is certainly deserving of more consideration than the author has seen fit to devote to it.

The last lecture in the series, "The Background of American Federalism," is essentially different in character and subject matter from the earlier addresses. It is a strictly scientific presentation of an important colonial question. This address, which has already appeared in the AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW, is not so much out of place in this series as might at first appear, inasmuch as the discussion of federal principles in the early American colonies serves to throw light upon some of the constitutional problems of the British Empire today.

These brief studies, we may then conclude, are admirably adapted to serve the educational purpose the author had in mind. They can scarce fail to promote a better understanding on both sides of the Atlantic and awaken a keener appreciation of the essential unity of Anglo-American ideals. The lectures, it must be admitted, are of greater present political interest than of future scholastic value, but this fact does not in any way detract from their general usefulness. For a more critical and exhaustive presentation of the questions at issue, the student of diplomacy may turn to Mr. Beer's recent work on *The English Speaking Peoples*.

C. D. ALLIN.

University of Minnesota.

The Responsible State: A Re-examination of Fundamental Political Doctrines in the Light of the World War and the Menace of Anarchism. By FRANKLIN HENRY GIDDINGS. (Colver Lectures, Brown University, 1918. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1918. Pp. xi, 108.)

These lectures comprise an unusually clear and interesting discussion of some of the broader, more habitual problems relating to the basis and scope of state authority and duty. The author's treatment of these questions seems, however, to be marred in some parts by defects in temper and method which cannot escape mention. Despite the broad title of the work and the comprehensive chapter headings, it would not perhaps be fair to complain that, in a brief series of lectures,

many important subjects within the fields indicated are overlooked. However, when the author, in bringing forward some particular question of state responsibility in order to set forth his views in the matter, selects for comparison or refutation only the obviously weakest alternatives to his doctrines, it seems not unfair to suggest inadequacy of treatment at such points. For example, when he discusses the topic of distributive justice under the state, he is concerned with the problem of inequalities in economic and cultural opportunity only in so far as to develop the familiar conclusion that, because of natural, congenital differences among individuals, absolute or rigid equality in comfort and attainment is not a practicable ideal. In this way he ignores more significant proposals of those who, while freely acknowledging the differences in "biological heredity," are concerned about inequalities, in status and opportunity, with which biological differences have nothing whatever to do.

It is perhaps far too soon to expect, even in academic quarters, judicious appreciation of the varieties of opinion which divided intelligent and patriotic people in this country before our entrance into the war. Professor Giddings speaks broadly and confidently of men "who from the first day of August 1914 saw the situation as it was;" and he assumes that it was the "increasingly respectful attention" gained "throughout the country and at Washington," by these exclusive patriots and prophets whom he has in mind (rather than interpretation and guidance from other sources) that finally brought our country "undivided" to the support of the war.

But despite the several parts in which the mood of complacent illiberalism prevails, the dominant or final tone of Professor Giddings's discussion in these lectures is probably more fairly found in other parts. His criticism of the traditional metaphysical conception of absolute sovereignty, though made upon a basis now becoming familiar through the writings of Duguit, Laski and others, is stated with especial effectiveness. His own definition of sovereignty might, however, be difficult to maintain against his test of applicability to concrete experience. His defense of universal military service is expressed in words less chauvinistic and arrogant than those we frequently hear. Finally, his full acceptance of the "experimental policy" (comprising "experiments in coöperation, including so-called 'syndicalism' and local communism, experiments in the municipal ownership and control of public utilities and of basic trades and industries, experiments in national ownership of railroads and mines") as the only method

whereby the issues between socialism and individualism can be resolved, should gain for him full credit for open-mindedness in regard to many political problems of chief and most immediate importance.

The slip—"John Hobbes" (page 29)—is quite uncharacteristic of the author.

F. W. COKER.

Ohio State University.

The Metaphysical Theory of the State: A Criticism. By L. T. HOBHOUSE, D.Lit., Martin White Professor of Sociology in the University of London. (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1918. Pp. 156.)

This volume, the substance of which was given in a course of lectures at the London School of Economics in the autumn of 1917, contains doubtless the most acute and thorough-going criticism of the Hegelian theory of the state that the great war has called forth. The author, in the dedication to his son, who was a lieutenant in the British air service, lamenting the disabilities of middle age which prevent him from meeting the enemy's Gothas in the air, devotes himself, by the tools and weapons which he can best use, to the same task of "making the world safe for democracy." "In the bombing of London," he says, "I had just witnessed the visible and tangible outcome of a false and wicked doctrine, the foundations of which lay, as I believe, in the book before me."

It is not Hegel, or his German disciples alone, however, who are the objects of his penetrating criticism and attack. A considerable portion of the book is a critique of Bosanquet's work, and particularly of his *Philosophical Theory of the State*, in which is found perhaps the most clear and forceful presentation of the contemporary English version of Hegelian idealism. Bosanquet, it may be remarked, is about the only English idealist who has ventured publicly to reiterate his adherence to a theory which has acquired such general opprobrium. In his work on *Social and International Ideals* which appeared in 1917 his doctrines are repeated in essentially unmodified form. These principles with all their implications are severely handled by the author.

The connection between Hegelian political theory and the irresponsible and unrestrained state action of the German government in recent years has been frequently pointed out, and is too obvious to be ques-